



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,903	08/22/2003	Daniel M. Lieberman	3998P2652	1335

23504 7590 10/17/2006

WEISS & MOY PC  
4204 NORTH BROWN AVENUE  
SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85251

EXAMINER
----------

MACNEILL, ELIZABETH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3767

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/646,903

Applicant(s)

LIEBERMAN, DANIEL M.

Examiner

Elizabeth R. MacNeill

Art Unit

3767

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11 and 14-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11 and 14-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is in response to applicant's amendment and argument submitted 11 October 2006. Claims 11 and 14-27 are pending in the application.

#### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 20 is objected to because of the following informalities: "leur" should be spelled "luer". Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by WILD (US 6,605,036).

Regarding claims 11,14-16, Wild teaches a method and apparatus for treating a subdural hematoma (Col 1 line 53) comprising a dual lumen catheter (1) with a drainage channel (10) with perforations (at distal end) and multiple irrigation channels (9) with perforations (at distal end).

Regarding claim 17, the drainage perforations have a diameter of less than 2mm (Col 12 line 28)

Art Unit: 3767

Regarding claim 18 and 19, a pressure valve is coupled to the irrigation channel ("A pressure and volume monitoring system of conventional construction is preferred for this purpose", Col 7 line 60)

Regarding claims 20 and 21, "The passive fluid escape channel is connected proximally to a drainage tube providing gravity drainage and collection of all fluids." (Col 7 line 46)

Regarding claim 22, a hole is drilled in the skull to access the subdural space (inherent to accessing the subdural space)

Regarding claim 23, a tuohy needle is provided (outer tube 25)

Regarding claim 24, a guidewire is provided (steerable push-pull wires)

Regarding claim 25, a stylette is provided (rigid telescope 2 functions in the same manner as a stylette, to provide temporary rigidity to the catheter)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wild as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of DARDIK et al (Journal of Vascular Surgery).

Wild teaches the limitations of the dual lumen catheter as above, but is silent on the duration of irrigation and drainage of the subdural hematoma.

Art Unit: 3767

Dardik et al teach that drains are removed from patients after three days (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the dual lumen catheter for three days, as taught by Dardik et al, as a well known medical procedure.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11 and 14-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. The previous indication of allowability of claims 11,16,17 and 23-25 is withdrawn in light of the newly discovered reference Wild. See rejection above.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth R. MacNeill whose telephone number is (571)-272-9970. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00-3:30pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Sirmons can be reached on (571)272-4965. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3767

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ERM

*Elizabeth*  
*MacNeil*  
*10/12/06*

KEVIN C. SIRMONS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

*Kevin C. Sirmons*